



International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)

Email: 3ie@3ieimpact.org

Web <http://www.3ieimpact.org>

3ie REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS UNDER THE THIRD OPEN WINDOW

3ie is pleased to announce a request for proposals (RFP) for impact evaluations of social and economic development interventions in low- and middle-income countries.

This call is being made under 3ie's Open Window, which accepts proposals in any sector. However, preference will be given for proposed studies which:

- Are impact evaluations of large-scale development interventions that have a high probability of influencing policy and include a clear communications strategy
- Have a clear and close partnership with the implementing agency
- Are produced by developing country researchers/evaluators or through a partnership between developed and developing country researchers/evaluators
- Have an evaluation design based on the theory of change underlying the programme with evaluation questions that address critical links in the causal chain

3ie hopes to make awards of up to a total value of US\$10 million under this RFP. There is no maximum size for individual grants.

More information may be found in the 'Instructions for Proposals', 'Principles for Impact Evaluation' and from the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on the 3ie website.

Any questions should be sent to Mr. Arun Virk, Program Officer, ow3@3ieimpact.org.

Submissions and review procedure

All submissions must be made using 3ie's online Grant Management System: <http://praxispts.com/3ieImpact/>

There is a two stage submission process:

1. Submission of an expression of interest (EOI), for which the deadline is 11.59 pm Eastern Standard Time (EST) July 5th 2010.
2. If the EOI is accepted, submission of a full application by 11.59 pm Eastern Standard Time (EST) on August 13th, 2010.

All applications are reviewed by one internal reviewer and three independent external reviewers. The average scores from these reviews will be used to prepare a shortlist of applications. A panel of policy makers will review and rank the shortlisted proposals for policy relevance and potential policy impact.

Final approval of awards is made by the 3ie Board of Commissioners.

3ie REVIEW CRITERIA

All criteria shall be scored from 0 to 10, and then combined according to the following weights:

- Policy relevance (10%)
- Potential policy impact in the near future (20%)
- Quality of technical proposal (35%)
- Qualifications of proposed staff (15%)
- Involvement of developing country researchers/evaluators (15%)
- Does application include a 3ie member or an 3ie associate member (5%)

These criteria are elaborated in the annex table to this RFP.

The communications plan is a required part of the proposal, but does not enter into the review process. If the proposal is successful, 3ie staff may engage with the grantee to develop, and ensure implementation of, this part of the work.

Value for money is not part of the selection process. The Review Panel will review the value for money of the proposals selected, and can indicate to 3ie staff that the budget needs discussion with the proposing organization. 3ie prepares a separate value for money review of all successful proposals.

ALL PROPOSALS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO USING 3ie's ONLINE GRANT APPLICATION SYSTEM. APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN ANY OTHER WAY WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.

Elaboration of review criteria

Term	Definition	Criteria	Scoring
Policy relevance	Policy relevance has two dimensions: (1) alignment with national and international priorities, and (2) the importance of the intervention.	.	Policy relevance is scored from 0-10, calculated as a simple average of the scores for alignment and importance.
	Alignment is defined as the extent to which the objectives of the intervention to be evaluated are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, and global priorities.	The issues addressed by the proposal are consistent with national and international policies, and enduring, meaning that it addresses policy questions that are likely to continue being important in 5 to 10 years time.	Reviewers should award a 0-10 score for alignment with national and international priorities
	Importance is defined as having either (i) substantial scale or expected effect size, or (ii) innovative intervention (not evaluation) design.	Importance is defined by <u>either</u> scale [(1) affect large numbers of people (national-level programs) or imply large resource outlays, (2) have large expected effects on particular subpopulations (large effect size)] <u>or</u> innovativeness of the intervention, with potential to go to scale.	Reviewers should score <u>either</u> scale <u>or</u> innovativeness on a scale of 0-10. In the case of scale, reviewers should score against both criteria on a scale of 0-10, and use only the higher of those two as the score.
Potential policy impact	The extent to which the study has the potential to influence national, regional and international policy.	<p>Potential policy impact is measured against factors in the evaluation process which make policy impact more likely. Policy impact is also a function of policy relevance and evaluation design, which are assessed under different headings.</p> <p>The factors assessed for policy impact are: (1) the engagement of key stakeholders in identification of the evaluation questions; (2) proven demand for the study, including clear indication of intended use of evaluation findings by the implementing agency; and (3) the quality of the</p>	<p>Policy relevance is scored from 0-10. Reviewers should award a 0-10 score to a proposal against each of the three* criteria, and record as the potential policy impact score as the <u>average</u> of these three*.</p> <p>Note: * criterion 3 only applies to OW proposals, not those submitted for Policy Window.</p>

		dissemination strategy for the study.	
Quality of technical proposal	The proposal is for a quality impact evaluation, which will address the questions of ‘what works, why and for how much?’ using the best available methodology.	Studies should be: (1) feasible, i.e. the information can be collected and analyzed in ways that make it possible to attribute impact to a particular program; and (2) rigorous if it meets accepted standards of evidence for attributing impact to a particular program (see 3ie’s Principles of Impact Evaluation). The way in which the design ensures policy relevance is taken into account.	Reviewers should assess: (1) the identification strategy, (2) treatment of spillovers and contamination; (3) adequacy of power calculations, (4) incorporation of intervention’s theory of change into the evaluation design, (5) the use of mixed-methods as appropriate and (6) cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit analysis. Reviewers should award an overall score of 0-10 taking into account all these aspects. A proposal may not score more than 6 if it has serious inadequacies with respect to any of the first four criteria.
Qualifications of proposed staff	The skills and experience of the proposed team in conducting impact evaluation	The PIs proposed to conduct the study should have the set of skills to implement the proposed design. Points are awarded for team members with prior experience of implementing impact studies consistent with 3ie’s Principles of Impact Evaluation.	The overall score is an average of the following, each scored 0-10: (1) experience of the PIs in conducting quality impact evaluations; (2) team member experience in managing fieldwork in a developing country (only one member need have this experience); and (3) proven success in disseminating research/evaluation findings.
Involvement of developing country researchers/evaluators	The extent to which developing country evaluators/researchers are involved in the proposed study. Developing country researchers are defined as developing country nationals resident in that country.	Points are awarded for the substantive involvement of developing country researchers/evaluators in the study team. Higher points are awarded the more substantive the involvement of the developing country nationals.	Reviewers should score proposals as follows: 0 - no developing country involvement; 1-3 developing country nationals involved in logistical aspects, including enumeration; 4-5 developing country researchers included as research assistants; 7-8 developing country researchers have substantive research role; 9 proposal led by developing country research institute with mixed team of PIs; 10 - proposal led by developing country research institute with only developing country PIs).